The Chief Engineer then pointed out that G.O. No. 235 I., dated 26th January 1929, did not order the investigation of the scheme for the excavation of a high-level channel from above Kattalai to irrigate at least 50,000 acres in Kulittalai and Trichinopoly taluks. Representations were also received by the Government from interested parties in the Trichinopoly district that this scheme also should be investigated. The Government have accordingly ordered that the special staff should investigate also the scheme for the excavation of a high-level channel from above Kattalai.

Land Revenue

Collection of penal assessment on lands cultivated wet in the Kistna Eastern delta.

* 1713 *Q.*—Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) the total amount of penal assessment collected on lands cultivated wet with Kistna water in Kistna Eastern delta in each of the faslis of 1337, 1336, 1335, 1334 and 1333 and the total number of acres on which the penal assessment has been collected in each fasli; and

(*b*) whether the Government intend to include all those lands under the ayacut of the delta under the proposed extension of ayacut?

A.—(*a*) The hon. Member is referred to (1) G.O. No. 1028, Revenue, dated 10th May 1928, which was placed on the table of the House on 3rd September 1928, and (2) the answers to clauses (*a*) and (*b*) of question No. 584, which were sent to him on 3rd January 1929. A copy of the latter is attached.[a] The Government have no further information.

(*b*) The Government cannot answer this without first knowing in respect of each field whether the inclusion fee was paid, and if the inclusion fee was paid, whether the conditions regarding levels have been satisfied.

Failure of crops in the Palghat taluk.

* 1714 *Q.*—Mr. K. Madhavan Nayar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government received any information since January 1929 about the failure of the second crop in the Palghat taluk; and

(*b*) whether the Government propose to call for a report or make an enquiry about the said failure of crops?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The reply to both clauses of the question is in the negative.

Mr. K. Madhavan Nayar:—"May I know if the hon. the Revenue Member will at least make an inquiry of his Colleague in the Executive Council as to the conditions in the Palghat taluk?"

The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks:—"I have no doubt as to the condition of the taluk, but what is the action that the hon. Member wishes the Government to take?"

[a] Printed as Appendix III on page 86 infra.

12th March 1929]

Mr. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR :—" There is a report that the second crop in the Palghat taluk has completely failed. May I know whether the Government will call for a report and do the needful ? The answer to the question is in the negative and that is the necessity for calling for a report. I am asking the hon. Revenue Member whether he will at least make an inquiry of his Colleague in the Executive Council who belongs to the Palghat taluk with regard to the necessity for doing something in the matter ? "

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" The suggestion 'to do the needful' does not appear in the question."

Minor Irrigation

Conservation of rain water in Malabar and South Kanara for cultivation purposes.

* 1715 Q.—Mr. A. B. SHETTY : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the possibilities of conserving rain water in Malabar and South Kanara for cultivation purposes by means of minor irrigation works have ever been investigated ; and

(b) if not, whether the Government propose to do it hereafter ?

A.—(a) The hon. Member is referred to the answer given to question No. 616 on 24th March 1925

(b) There is no such proposal under the consideration of the Government.

Mr. A. B. SHETTY :—" May I know from the hon. the Revenue Member whether the question regarding the scope for minor irrigation work in South Kanara has ever been examined ? "

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" I should very much doubt it, Sir."

Survey

Refusal of permission to quarry stones by the Zamindar of Surangy.

* 1716 Q.—Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government are aware of the fact that the Zamindar of Surangy (Ganjam) refused permission to Mr. W. V. B. Ramalingam, contractor of the Survey Party No. V, to quarry stones from certain hillocks within the Zamindari on payment of seigniorage in connexion with the survey operations sanctioned by the Government on the application of the ryots under section 164 of Estates Land Act ; and

(b) the action that is proposed to be taken ?

A.—(a) The Government have not heard of the incident. The Government claim no mining rights in permanently-settled estates and know of no law under which the owner of such an estate can be compelled to allow quarrying by a Government contractor.

(b) The question is not understood.